

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,266	10/23/2003	Arthur R. Piehl	200312416-1	1571
22879	7590 12/16/2004	EXAMINER		
	PACKARD COMPAN	MAHONEY, CHRISTOPHER E		
	400, 3404 E. HARMON	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400			2851	
	,		DATE MAILED: 12/16/200-	4

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Applica	ation No.	Applicant(s)	0		
Office Action Summary		10/692	,266	PIEHL, ARTHUR R.			
		Examir	ier	Art Unit			
		Christo	pher E Mahoney	2851			
	The MAILING DATE of this commun	ication appears on	the cover sheet with the	e correspondence addres	SS		
Period fo	• •	OD DEDLY IS SET	TO EVDIDE 4 MONT	U(C) EDOM			
THE - Exte after - If the - If NO - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD F MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUN nsions of time may be available under the provisions SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this commet period for reply specified above is less than thirty (3) openiod for reply is specified above, the maximum street to reply within the set or extended period for reply reply received by the Office later than three months are departed term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ICATION. of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In nonunication. io) days, a reply within the atutory period will apply an will, by statute, cause the	event, however, may a reply be statutory minimum of thirty (30) of will expire SIX (6) MONTHS frapplication to become ABANDO	e timely filed days will be considered timely. om the mailing date of this commu NED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	unication.		
Status			•				
1)	Responsive to communication(s) file	ed on .		,	,		
,—	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	2b)⊠ This action is	s non-final.				
3)□							
,	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposit	ion of Claims						
4)⊠	Claim(s) 1-42 is/are pending in the a	application.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.						
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
•	☐ Claim(s) is/are anowed. ☐ Claim(s) <u>1-42</u> is/are rejected.						
-	Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.						
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)□	The specification is objected to by th	e Examiner.					
• —	The drawing(s) filed on 23 October 2		ccepted or b) object	ed to by the Examiner.			
٠٠,٣	Applicant may not request that any obje			•			
	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including				.121(d).		
11)	The oath or declaration is objected to		* * *				
Priority :	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	•					
_	•	for foreign priority	undor 25 11 C C & 110	(a) (d) or (f)			
	Acknowledgment is made of a claim ☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:	for foreign priority	inder 35 U.S.C. 9 119	(a)-(u) or (i).			
a)	1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority	documents have h	oon received				
	2. Certified copies of the priority			ation No			
	3. Copies of the certified copies		• •		ae.		
	application from the Internation			ived in this readonal eta	go		
* 6	See the attached detailed Office action	•	` ''	ived.			
			,				
Attachmen							
	ce of References Cited (PTO-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (F	PTO-948)	4) Interview Summa Paper No(s)/Mail				
	mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or		5) Notice of Informa	al Patent Application (PTO-152	2)		
Pape	er No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/23/03</u> .	,	6)				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim 10 contains the trademark/trade name Texas Red. Where a trademark or trade name is used in a claim as a limitation to identify or describe a particular material or product, the claim does not comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph. See *Ex parte Simpson*, 218 USPQ 1020 (Bd. App. 1982). The claim scope is uncertain since the trademark or trade name cannot be used properly to identify any particular material or product. A trademark or trade name is used to identify a source of goods, and not the goods themselves. Thus, a trademark or trade name does not identify or describe the goods associated with the trademark or trade name. In the present case, the trademark/trade name is used to identify/describe an optical dye and, accordingly, the identification/description is indefinite.

The applicant is also requested to clarify the meaning of EYFP (perhaps enhanced yellow fluorescent protein) and to declare if EYFP, Sytox Blue and Alexa 633 are definite, determinable colors or if they are source identifiers (even if not trademarks).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Art Unit: 2851

Claims 1-2, 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-24, 26-27, 29-32, 34-36, and 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Do (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,560). Do teaches a projection screen 24 comprising a substrate having thereon one or more fluorescent materials (col. 3. lines 41 and 51, col. 5, lines 30-45) that emit visible light in red (col. 5, lines 31-35), green (col. 5, lines 36-40), and blue (col. 5, lines 41-45) wavelengths, upon receiving incident thereon, light in the UV spectrum (col. 5, line 49). One or more absorption materials (metal or color plastic) absorb wavelengths of light that are not included in the one or more ranges and not included in the other range (col. 5, lines 62-67).

Claims 1-3, 5-9, 11-13, 15-17, 19-24, 26-27, 29-32, 34-36, and 38-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Friesem (U.S. Patent No. 3,881,800). Friesem teaches a projection screen 20 comprising a substrate 10 having thereon one or more fluorescent materials 12 (col. 1, lines 50-54, col. 2, lines3-4) that emit visible light in red, green, and blue wavelengths (figure 2, col. 2, lines 3-5), upon receiving incident thereon, light in the UV spectrum (col. 1, line 57). One or more absorption materials (col2, line 1) absorb wavelengths of light that are not included in the one or more ranges and not included in the other range. Primer dots 11 are disposed between the fluorescent material and the substrate to reflect light in the one or more ranges (col 2, lines15-19).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person

Application/Control Number: 10/692,266

Art Unit: 2851

having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claim 4, 14, 18, 25, 28, 33, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Do (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,560) in view of Spector (U.S. Patent No. 4,323,301) or in view of Freese (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,306). Do teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for a Lambertian distribution. Both Spector (col. 1, line 18) and Freese (col. 8, line 21) teach that it was known to produce a screen with Lambertian distribution. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize the features taught by Spector or Frees for the purpose of providing uniform brightness or uniform viewing throughout any angle.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Do (U.S. Patent No. 5,957,560). Do teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the specific optical dyes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Texas Red, Sytox Blue, or Alexa 633, for the purpose of utilizing commercially available materials. The applicant should note that it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ 416.

Claim 4, 14, 18, 25, 28, 33, and 37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friesem (U.S. Patent No. 3,881,800) in view of Spector (U.S. Patent No. 4,323,301) or in view of Freese (U.S. Patent No. 6,816,306). Friesem teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for a Lambertian distribution. Both Spector (col. 1, line 18) and Freese (col. 8, line 21) teach that it was known to produce a screen with Lambertian distribution. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

Application/Control Number: 10/692,266

Art Unit: 2851

invention was made to utilize the features taught by Spector or Frees for the purpose of providing

uniform brightness or uniform viewing throughout any angle.

416. The applicant is also directed to review col. 1, lines 47-60.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Friesem (U.S. Patent No. 3,881,800). Friesem teaches the salient features of the claimed invention except for the specific optical dyes. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to utilize Texas Red, Sytox Blue, or Alexa 633, for the purpose of utilizing commercially available materials. The applicant should note that it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice. *In re Leshin*, 125 USPQ

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Christopher E Mahoney whose telephone number is (571) 272-2122. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30AM-5PM, Monday-Thursday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Judy Nguyen can be reached on (571) 272-2258. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Application/Control Number: 10/692,266 Page 6

Art Unit: 2851

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Christopher E Mahoney

Primary Examiner

Art Unit 2851